

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-18 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-17 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,185,623 issued to Bailey (*Bailey*) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0168157 of Marchand (*Marchand*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-17 are not rendered obvious by *Bailey* and *Marchand*.

Claim 1 recites:

receiving, with a server device, a request from a first client device to download a file to be transmitted as a plurality of packets of data from the server device;

multicasting the plurality of packets of data from the server device to multiple client devices using a first transmission protocol that comprises a non-reliable multicast transmission protocol, wherein the multiple client devices include at least the first client device;

requesting, when the first client has completed download of the file, from the server device with a second client device from the multiple client devices packets of data not received by the second client device, wherein the request utilizes a second transmission protocol that comprises reliable protocol.

Thus, Applicants claim transmitting a file as a plurality of data packets via a first, non-reliable multicast protocol. After the requesting client has received the file, another client requests missing packets using a second, reliable protocol. Independent claims 7 and 13 recite similar limitations.

Bailey discloses use of a multicast protocol. Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Bailey* fails to teach or suggest use of a reliable protocol. *Marchand* discloses multicast in multiple stages. Retransmission is also accomplished using multicast protocols. See paragraph 53 and 57. Therefore, neither *Marchand* nor *Bailey*, alone or in combination, can teach or suggest the use of two protocols in the manner recited in the claims.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1. Claims 8-11 depend from claim 7. Claims 14-17 depend from claim 13. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2-5, 8-11 and 14-17 are not rendered obvious by *Bailey* and *Marchand* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 6, 12 and 18 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Bailey* and *Marchand* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,983,334 issued to Riedle (*Riedle*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 6, 12 and 18 are not rendered obvious by *Bailey*, *Marchand* and *Riedle*.

Riedle is cited to teach a second device that tracks gaps within a requested file and the size of the packet gaps. See Office Action at page 7. However, *Riedle* does not cure the deficiencies of *Bailey* and *Marchand* as set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Bailey*, *Marchand* and *Riedle* can teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 6, 12 and 18.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance and such action is

earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: September 14, 2009

/Paul A. Mendonsa/
Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778